

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 10/564,608	Applicant(s) HALL ET AL.	
	Examiner S. Joseph Morano	Art Unit 3617	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) S. Joseph Morano. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Joseph Catanzaro. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 23 November 2010.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/S. Joseph Morano/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3617
--	--

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative contacted SPE Morano to indicate that a typographical error appeared in the Examiner's amendment mailed 11/09/10, and that the examiner was contacted but applicant's representative and the examiner were exchanging phone messages and were unable to talk directly. According to applicant's representative's notes, the 2nd phrase inserted by the examiner in paragraph 5 of the amendment should have inserted the phrase before the comma and not after. While applicant can file a 312 amendment to correct such things, applicant's representative requested that the USPTO perform the correction to spare applicant the expense and effort of having to recopy, underline and/or bracket, and resubmit all the claims just to move a comma. Since the examiner was on leave and in the interest of customer service to expedite this application to issue, such correction has been made herein .